

## Section B: Your Representation

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation that you wish to make. You must complete 'Part A – Personal Details' for your representation to be accepted.

Representations cannot be treated as confidential and will be published on our Consultation Portal. Any representations that are considered libelous, racist, abusive or offensive will not be accepted. All representations made will only be attributed to your name. We will not publish any contact details, signatures or other sensitive information.

Full Name

RICHARD DARREN FISMEYER

Question 1: Which **Main Modification and/or supporting document** does your representation relate to?

Each Main Modification within the Schedule has a reference number. This can be found in the first column i.e. MM1, MM2

Any representations on a supporting document should clearly state which paragraphs of the document it relates to and, as far as possible, your comments should be linked to specific Main Modifications. You should avoid lengthy comments on the supporting documents themselves.

Representations on the Policies Map must be linked to specific modifications in that they reflect a change required as a result of a Main Modification.

Schedule of Potential Main Modifications

MM no.

MM 1/2/5  
78, 81, 107 + 108.

Sustainability Appraisal

para(s)

Habitat Regulations Assessment

para(s)

Policies Map or other supporting documents

Please specify

Question 2: Do you consider this **Main Modification and/or supporting document**:

Legally Compliant?

YES

☐

NO

☐

Sound?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Question 3: If you consider the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** unsound, please indicate which of the soundness test(s) does it fail (please mark all that apply):

Not positively prepared

☐

Not justified

☒

Not effective

☐

Not consistent with national planning policy

☐

Question 4: Please provide details of either:

- Why you consider the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** to be sound or legally compliant; or
- Why you consider the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** to be unsound or is not legally compliant.

mm1/mm2 - Blackmore is a small mainly residential village with about 300 dwellings. The increase by possibly 70 is a proportionately inconsistent with the roads surrounding it. The number is too high and unjustified for such a small village.

mm7/108 - As above, the local public were consulted on the R25/R26 developments and the decision was made to listen to the village's view and reduce the number of houses proposed from 70 to 50. The latest changes have ignored this consultation and reverted back to 70. I do not consider listening, adjusting and then ignoring the village's views justified.

mm5 - Blackmore has a small convenience store, tear shop, antique shop and two pubs. This should not be classified in the same way as Doddington, Redwood Heath which are much bigger.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

P.T.O.

mm78 -

Flooding has been a well recognised issue in Bhamston with flood water catching drivers out in Redise lane and obstructed roads, on an annual basis. Reducing the local field (which allows some drainage) and replacing it with roads and housing, as seen repeatedly in other <sup>development</sup> areas, only leads to more flooding - particularly where there is a problem already - which we have. - Again, making the proposed development site unjustified.

mm81 -

I do not believe the 'exceptional circumstances' test was carried out adequately enough. If so, the locations available in Redise lane (now Snayver paddocks) would have been identified along with those in Standon nursery and put in the LDP.

Question 5: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** sound or legally compliant, having regard to the matters that you identified above.

You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan sound or legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as accurate as possible.

I believe that it is ultimately unjustified to build 70 houses in the proposed site as indicated previously. 8 houses have already been built in Sudjor Meadows and were just a short distance in Norton Heath. The location is environmentally unsound due to flooding and inadequate transport links and therefore my proposal would be a significant reduction from 70 as to relocate the proposed houses to better field sites.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary